

## REMARKS

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 6, 7, 12, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by publication EP 0674441 A1) by Huuhtanen that describes a method for scrambling a television signal. The Applicant has amended the claims that the Applicant believes renders the amended claims patentable over Huuhtanen. For example, claim 1 has been amended to, at least, included limitations of dependent claim 17 teaching that at least two groups of data packets are encrypted. The Examiner had rejected claim 17 based upon the following rationale:

“forming a second group of encrypted data packets by encrypting some of the number of data packets not already encrypted based upon a second set of encryption values (Col. 3 lines 47 – 50)...the data packets will be sent in groups in a consecutive order (i.e., first group of encrypted data packets, and second group of encrypted data packets etc.) and *each group of data packets are encrypted with different keys* in order to prevent a hacker from copying or obtaining the multimedia content, the use of different keys to encrypt the different segments of the various multimedia content is done so only a segment of a multimedia transmission is compromised instead of the entire multimedia content transmission...”

The Applicants have thoroughly reviewed the cited reference and have failed to find any teaching or suggestion of multiple encryption keys and therefore, the Applicants believe that the limitations of claim 17 that have been amended to claim 1 now pending are not taught by the reference and is therefore allowable renders claim 1 allowable. Moreover, the reference specifically requires that some of the data packets be left unscrambled in contrast to claim 1 the requires that all data packets be encrypted albeit using at least two different encryption protocols. At no point does the reference describe anything more than scrambling some but not all of the data packets. As a matter of fact, the reference specifically teaches that some of the data packets must remain unscrambled in order to provide a viewer with some indication of the material being received.

Independent claims 6 and 12 recite essentially the same limitations as claim 1 and are also believed to be allowable.

All remaining dependent claims depend either directly or indirectly from claims 1, 6 and 12 and are also believed to be allowable.

A number of secondary references were also cited, however, none of them in any combination with the primary reference is believed by the Applicant to render any of the currently amended claims as unpatentable as being obvious.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are allowable. Should the Examiner believe that a further telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER LLP

/Michael J. Ferrazano/  
Michael J. Ferrazano  
Reg. No. 44,105

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
(408) 255-8001